

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/456,869	12/08/1999	DAVID ELLIOT WHITTEN	600.1027	7022
23280 7	590 09/26/2002			
DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC			EXAMINER	
485 SEVENTI NEW YORK,	I AVENUE, 14TH FLO NY 10018	OOR	KIM, EUGENE LEE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3721	
			DATE MAILED: 09/26/2002	2 /3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

شين			S.MI
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/456,869	WHITTEN, DAVID ELLIOT	
nance, neach	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Eugene Kim	3721	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cov r sheet with the d	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 16 September 2002 FAILS TO PLA Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	avoid abandonment of this appli 1) a timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper re ich places the appli	oly to a cation in
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	nan SIX MONTHS from the mailing date on sTILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. S	See MPEP
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The danave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortener (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three meanned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	nsion and the corresponding amount of the distance of the dist	e fee. The appropriate ex the final Office action; or	tension fee under (2) as set forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered by	oecause:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require furth	ner consideration and/or search	(see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note	below);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	terially reducing or s	simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cance	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected clair	ms.
NOTE:			
Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ction(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	d be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely file	d amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: Set	or reconsideration has been consecution of the continuation Sheet.	sidered but does NO	OT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	ere newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims w			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows	:		
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	s a) □ approved or b) □ disap	proved by the Exan	niner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	ent(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	<i></i>	~
10. Other:		huge !	
		EUGENE PRIMADY	'IM 'ER

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

pequivalent z

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance becaus: examiner maintains rejection set forth in paper no. 11. Examiner argued that element 42b is a mechanical equivalent to applicant's gripper means since it holds a workpiece flat and it would have been an obvious matter of design choice as discussed in the previous office action..